Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis Will be set by the publisher
Modélisation Mathématique et Analyse Numérique

arXiv:0704.0783v2 [math.NA] 20 Nov 2007

STABILITY OF A FINITE VOLUME SCHEME FOR THE INCOMPRESSIBLE FLUIDS

Sébastien Zimmermann[1]

Abstract. We introduce a finite volume scheme for the two-dimensional incompressible Navier-Stokes equations. We use a triangular mesh. The unknowns for the velocity and pressure are respectively piecewise constant and affine. We use a projection method to deal with the incompressibility constraint. We show that the differential operators in the Navier-Stokes equations and their discrete counterparts share similar properties. In particular we state an inf-sup (Babuška-Brezzi) condition. Using these properties we infer the stability of the scheme.

Résumé. Nous introduisons ici un schéma volumes finis pour les équations de Navier-Stokes incompressibles en deux dimensions. Les maillages considérés sont formés de triangles. Les inconnues associées à la vitesse et la pression sont respectivement constantes et affines par morceaux. Nous utilisons une méthode de projection pour traiter la contrainte d'incompressibilité. Nous vérifions que les opérateurs différentiels apparaissant dans les équations de Navier-Stokes et leurs analogues discrets vérifient des propriétés similaires. Nous prouvons en particulier une condition inf-sup. Nous en déduisons la stabilité du schéma.

1991 Mathematics Subject Classification. 76D05, 74S10, 65M12.

Received: 13 august 2007.

1. Introduction

We consider the flow of an incompressible fluid in a polyhedral set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ during the time interval $[0,T]$. The velocity field $\mathbf{u} : \Omega \times [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}^2$ and the pressure field $p : \Omega \times [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfy the Navier-Stokes equations

$$\mathbf{u}_t - \frac{1}{\mathrm{Re}}\, \boldsymbol{\Delta} \mathbf{u} + (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{u} + \nabla p = \mathbf{f}\,, \tag{1.1}$$

$$\operatorname{div}\, \mathbf{u} = 0\,, \tag{1.2}$$

with the boundary and initial conditions

$$\mathbf{u}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0\,, \qquad \qquad \mathbf{u}|_{t=0} = \mathbf{u}_0.$$

The terms $\boldsymbol{\Delta}\mathbf{u}$ and $(\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{u}$ are associated with the physical phenomena of diffusion and convection, respectively. The Reynolds number Re measures the influence of convection in the flow. For equations (1.1)–(1.2), finite element and finite difference methods are well known and mathematical studies are available (see [9] for example).

Keywords and phrases: Incompressible fluids, Navier-Stokes equations, projection methods, finite volume.

[1] 17 rue Barrème - 69006 LYON. e-mail: `Sebastien.Zimmermann@ec-lyon.fr`

© EDP Sciences, SMAI 1999

For finite volume schemes, numerous computations have been conducted ([12] and [1] for example). However, few mathematical results are available in this case. Let us cite EYMARD AND HERBIN [6] and EYMARD, LATCHÉ AND HERBIN [7]. In order to deal with the incompressibility constraint (1.2), these works use a penalization method. Another way is to use the projection methods which have been introduced by CHORIN [4] and TEMAM [13]. This is the case in FAURE [8] where the mesh is made of squares. In ZIMMERMANN [14] the mesh is made of triangles, so that more complex geometries can be considered. In the present paper the mesh is also made of triangles, but we consider a different discretization for the pressure. It leads to a linear system with a better-conditioned matrix. The layout of the article is the following. We first introduce in section 2 the discrete setting. We state (section 2.1) some notations and hypotheses on the mesh. We define (section 2.2) the spaces we use to approximate the velocity and pressure. We define also (section 2.3) the operators we use to approximate the differential operators in (1.1)–(1.2). Combining this with a projection method, we build the scheme in section 3. In order to provide a mathematical analysis, we show in section 4 that the differential operators in (1.1)–(1.2) and their discrete counterparts share similar properties. In particular, the discrete operators for the gradient and the divergence are adjoint. The discrete operator for the convection term is positive, stable and consistent. The discrete operator for the divergence satisfy an inf-sup (Babuška-Brezzi) condition. From these properties we deduce in section 5 the stability of the scheme.

We conclude with some notations. The spaces $(L^2, |.|)$ and $(L^\infty, \|.\|_\infty)$ are the usual Lebesgue spaces and we set $L^2_0 = \{q \in L^2\,;\int_\Omega q(\mathbf{x})\,d\mathbf{x} = 0\}$. Their vectorial counterparts are $(\mathbb{L}^2, |.|)$ and $(\mathbb{L}^\infty, \|.\|_\infty)$ with $\mathbb{L}^2 = (L^2)^2$ and $\mathbb{L}^\infty = (L^\infty)$. For $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $(H^k, \|\cdot\|_k)$ is the usual Sobolev space. Its vectorial counterpart is $(\mathbf{H}^k, \|.\|_k)$ with $\mathbf{H}^k = (H^k)^2$. For $k = 1$, the functions of $\mathbf{H}^1$ with a null trace on the boundary form the space $\mathbf{H}^1_0$. Also, we set $\nabla\mathbf{u} = (\nabla u_1, \nabla u_2)^T$ if $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2) \in \mathbf{H}^1$. If $\mathbf{X} \subset \mathbb{L}^2$ is a Banach space, we define $\mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbf{X})$ (resp. $L^2(0,T;\mathbf{X})$) as the set of the applications $\mathbf{g} : [0,T] \to \mathbf{X}$ such that $t \to |\mathbf{g}(t)|$ is continuous (resp. square integrable). The norm $\|.\|_{\mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbf{X})}$ is defined by $\|\mathbf{g}\|_{\mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbf{X})} = \sup_{s\in[0,T]} |\mathbf{g}(s)|$. In all calculations, C is a generic positive constant, depending only on Ω, $\mathbf{u}_0$ and $\mathbf{f}$.

2. DISCRETE SETTING

First, we introduce the spaces and the operators needed to build the scheme.

2.1. **The mesh**

Let $\mathcal{T}_h$ be a triangular mesh of Ω. The circumscribed circle of a triangle $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ is centered at $\mathbf{x}_K$ and has the diameter h_K. We set $h = \max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} h_K$. We assume that all the interior angles of the triangles of the mesh are less than $\frac{\pi}{2}$, so that $\mathbf{x}_K \in K$. The set of the edges of the triangle $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ is $\mathcal{E}_K$. The symbol $\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma}$ denotes the unit vector normal to an edge $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K$ and pointing outward K. We denote by $\mathcal{E}_h$ the set of the edges of the mesh. We distinguish the subset $\mathcal{E}_h^{int} \subset \mathcal{E}_h$ (resp. $\mathcal{E}_h^{ext}$) of the edges located inside Ω (resp. on $\partial\Omega$). The middle of an edge $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h$ is $\mathbf{x}_\sigma$ and its length $|\sigma|$. For each edge $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{int}$, let K_σ and L_σ be the two triangles having σ in common. We set $d_\sigma = d(\mathbf{x}_{K_\sigma}, \mathbf{x}_{L_\sigma})$. For all $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{ext}$, only the triangle K_σ located inside Ω is defined and we set $d_\sigma = d(\mathbf{x}_{K_\sigma}, \mathbf{x}_\sigma)$. Then for all $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h$ we set $\tau_\sigma = \frac{|\sigma|}{d_\sigma}$. As in [5] we assume the following on the mesh: there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\forall\,\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h\,, \qquad d_\sigma \geq C\,|\sigma| \quad \text{and} \quad |\sigma| \geq C\,h.$$

It implies that there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\forall\,\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{int}\,, \qquad \tau_\sigma = |\sigma|/d_\sigma \geq C. \tag{2.1}$$

2.2. **The discrete spaces**

We first define

$$P_0 = \{q \in L^2\ ;\ \forall\,K \in \mathcal{T}_h,\ \ q|_K \text{ is a constant}\}\,, \qquad \mathbf{P}_0 = (P_0)^2.$$

For the sake of concision, we set for all $q_h \in P_0$ (resp. $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$) and all triangle $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$: $q_K = q_h|_K$ (resp. $\mathbf{v}_K = \mathbf{v}_h|_K$). Although $\mathbf{P}_0 \not\subset \mathbf{H}^1$, we define the discrete equivalent of a $\mathbf{H}^1$ norm as follows. For all $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$ we set

$$\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h = \left(\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{int}} \tau_\sigma \, |\mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma} - \mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma}|^2 + \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{ext}} \tau_\sigma \, |\mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma}|^2 \right)^{1/2} . \tag{2.2}$$

We have [5] a Poincaré-like inequality: there exists $C > 0$ such that for all $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$

$$|\mathbf{v}_h| \le C \, \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h. \tag{2.3}$$

We also have [14] an inverse inequality: there exists $C > 0$ such that for all $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$

$$h \, \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h \le C \, |\mathbf{v}_h|. \tag{2.4}$$

From the norm $\|.\|_h$ we deduce a dual norm. For all $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$ we set

$$\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{-1,h} = \sup_{\boldsymbol{\psi}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0} \frac{(\mathbf{v}_h, \boldsymbol{\psi}_h)}{\|\boldsymbol{\psi}_h\|_h}. \tag{2.5}$$

For all $\mathbf{u}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$ and $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$ we have $(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) \le \|\mathbf{u}_h\|_{-1,h} \, \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h$. We define the projection operator $\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0} : \text{Ł}^2 \to \mathbf{P}_0$ as follows. For all $\mathbf{w} \in \text{Ł}^2$, $\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{w} \in \mathbf{P}_0$ is given by

$$\forall \, K \in \mathcal{T}_h \, , \qquad (\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{w})|_K = \frac{1}{|K|} \int_K \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x}. \tag{2.6}$$

We easily check that for all $\mathbf{w} \in \text{Ł}^2$ and $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$ we have $(\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}_h) = (\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}_h)$. We deduce from this that $\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}$ is stable for the Ł^2 norm. We define also the operator $\widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P}_0} : \mathbf{H}^2 \to \mathbf{P}_0$. For all $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbf{H}^2$, $\widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{w} \in \mathbf{P}_0$ is given by

$$\forall \, K \in \mathcal{T}_h \, , \qquad \widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{w}|_K = \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{x}_K).$$

According to the Sobolev embedding theorem, $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbf{H}^2$ is a.e. equal to a continuous function. Therefore the definition above makes sense. We introduce also the finite element spaces

$$\begin{array}{rcl} P_1^d & = & \{ v \in L^2 \, ; \, \forall \, K \in \mathcal{T}_h, \;\; v|_K \text{ is affine} \} \, , \\ P_1^{nc} & = & \{ v_h \in P_1^d \, ; \, \forall \, \sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{int}, \, v_h|_{K_\sigma}(\mathbf{x}_\sigma) = v_h|_{L_\sigma}(\mathbf{x}_\sigma) \, , \\ \mathbf{P}_1^c & = & \{ \mathbf{v}_h \in (P_1^d)^2 \, ; \, \mathbf{v}_h \text{ is continuous and } \mathbf{v}_h|_{\partial\Omega} = \mathbf{0} \}. \end{array}$$

We have $\mathbf{P}_1^c \subset \mathbf{H}_0^1$. We define $\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_1^c} : \mathbf{H}_0^1 \to \mathbf{P}_1^c$. For all $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2) \in \mathbf{H}_0^1$, $\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_1^c}\mathbf{v} = (v_h^1, v_h^2) \in \mathbf{P}_1^c$ is given by

$$\forall \, \boldsymbol{\phi}_h = (\phi_h^1, \phi_h^2) \in \mathbf{P}_1^c \, , \qquad \sum_{i=1}^{2} \big(\nabla v_h^i, \nabla \phi_h^i \big) = \sum_{i=1}^{2} \big(\nabla v_i, \nabla \phi_h^i \big).$$

The operator $\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_1^c}$ is stable for the $\mathbf{H}^1$ norm. One checks ([2] p. 110) that there exists $C > 0$ such that for all $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}^1$

$$|\mathbf{v} - \Pi_{\mathbf{P}_1^c}\mathbf{v}| \le C \, h \, \|\mathbf{v}\|_1. \tag{2.7}$$

Let us address now the space P_1^{nc}. If $q_h \in P_1^{nc}$, we have usually $\nabla q_h \notin \text{Ł}^2$. Thus we define the operator $\nabla_h : P_1^{nc} \to \mathbf{P}_0$ by setting for all $q_h \in P_0$ and all triangle $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$

$$\nabla_h q_h|_K = \frac{1}{|K|} \int_K \nabla q_h \, d\mathbf{x}. \tag{2.8}$$

The associated norm is defined by

$$\|q_h\|_{1,h} = \left(|q_h|^2 + |\nabla_h q_h|^2\right)^{1/2}.$$

We have a Poincaré-like inequality : there exists $C > 0$ such that for all $q_h \in P_1^{nc} \cap L_0^2$

$$|q_h| \le C\,|\nabla_h q_h|. \tag{2.9}$$

We define the projection operator $\Pi_{P_1^{nc}}$. For all $q \in H^1$, $\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q$ is given by

$$\forall\,\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h\,, \qquad \int_\sigma (\Pi_{P_1^{nc}} q)\,d\sigma = \int_\sigma q\,d\sigma.$$

One checks ([2] p.110) that there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$|p - \Pi_{P_1^{nc}} p| \le C\,h\,\|p\|_1\,, \qquad \left|\widetilde{\nabla}_h (p - \Pi_{P_1^{nc}} p)\right| \le C\,\|p\|_1. \tag{2.10}$$

Finally, we use the Raviart-Thomas spaces (see [3])

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{RT_0^d} &= \{\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{P}_1^d\,;\quad \forall\,\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K,\quad \mathbf{v}_h|_K \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma} \text{ is a constant,} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{v}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0\}\,,\\
\mathbf{RT_0} &= \{\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{RT_0^d}\,;\quad \forall\,K \in \mathcal{T}_h,\quad \forall\,\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K,\quad \mathbf{v}_h|_{K_\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K_\sigma,\sigma} = \mathbf{v}_h|_{L_\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K_\sigma,\sigma}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

For all $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{RT_0}$, $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K$ we set $(\mathbf{v}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})_\sigma = \mathbf{v}_h|_K \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma}$. We define the operator $\Pi_{\mathbf{RT_0}} : \mathbf{H}^1 \to \mathbf{RT_0}$. For all $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}^1$, $\Pi_{\mathbf{RT_0}} \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{RT_0}$ is given by

$$\forall\,K \in \mathcal{T}_h\,, \qquad \forall\,\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K\,, \qquad (\Pi_{\mathbf{RT_0}} \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})_\sigma = \frac{1}{|\sigma|}\int_\sigma \mathbf{v}\,d\sigma. \tag{2.11}$$

2.3. **The discrete operators**

The equations (1.1)–(1.2) use the differential operators gradient, divergence and laplacian. Using the spaces of section 2.2, we define their discrete counterparts. The discrete gradient $\nabla_h : P_1^{nc} \to \mathbf{P}_0$ is defined by (2.8). The discrete divergence operator $\mathrm{div}_h : \mathbf{P}_0 \to P_1^{nc}$ is built so that it is adjoint to the operator ∇_h. We set for all $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$ and all triangle $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\forall\,\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{int}, && (\mathrm{div}_h\,\mathbf{v}_h)(\mathbf{x}_\sigma) = \frac{3\,|\sigma|}{|K_\sigma| + |L_\sigma|}\,(\mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma} - \mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma}) \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma}\,;\\
&\forall\,\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{ext}, && (\mathrm{div}_h\,\mathbf{v}_h)(\mathbf{x}_\sigma) = -\frac{3\,|\sigma|}{|K_\sigma| + |L_\sigma|}\,\mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

The first discrete laplacian $\Delta_h : P_1^{nc} \to P_1^{nc}$ ensures that the incompressibility constraint (1.2) is satisfied in a discrete sense (see the proof of proposition 3.1 below). We set for all $q_h \in P_1^{nc}$

$$\Delta_h q_h = \mathrm{div}_h(\nabla_h q_h).$$

The second discrete laplacian $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h : \mathbf{P}_0 \to \mathbf{P}_0$ is the usual operator in finite volume schemes [5]. We set for all $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$ and all triangle $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$

$$\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h \mathbf{v}_h|_K = \frac{1}{|K|}\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_h^{int}} \tau_\sigma\,(\mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma} - \mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma}) - \frac{1}{|K|}\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_h^{ext}} \tau_\sigma\,\mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma}.$$

In order to approximate the term $(\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{u}$ in (1.1) we define a bilinear form $\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h : \mathbf{RT_0}\times\mathbf{P}_0 \to \mathbf{P}_0$ using the well-known upwind scheme [5]. For all $\mathbf{u}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$, $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$, and all triangle $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ we set

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h(\mathbf{u}_h,\mathbf{v}_h)\big|_K = \frac{1}{|K|}\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K\cap\mathcal{E}_h^{int}} |\sigma|\,\Big((\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})_\sigma^+\,\mathbf{v}_K + (\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})_\sigma^-\,\mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma}\Big). \tag{2.13}$$

We have set $a^+ = \max(a,0)$, $a^- = \min(a,0)$ for all $a\in\mathbb{R}$. Lastly, we define the trilinear form $\mathrm{b}_h : \mathbf{RT_0}\times\mathbf{P}_0\times\mathbf{P}_0 \to \mathbb{R}^2$ as follows. For all $\mathbf{u}_h\in\mathbf{RT_0}$, $\mathbf{v}_h\in\mathbf{P}_0$, $\mathbf{w}_h\in\mathbf{P}_0$, we set

$$\mathrm{b}_h(\mathbf{u}_h,\mathbf{v}_h,\mathbf{w}_h) = \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} |K|\,\mathbf{w}_K\cdot\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h(\mathbf{u}_h,\mathbf{v}_h)\big|_K. \tag{2.14}$$

3. The scheme

In order to deal with the incompressibility constraint (1.2) we use a projection method. This kind of method has been introduced by Chorin [4] and Temam [13]. The basic idea is the following. The time interval $[0,T]$ is split with a time step k: $[0,T] = \bigcup_{n=0}^N [t_n,t_{n+1}]$ with $N\in\mathbb{N}^*$ and $t_n = n\,k$ for all $n\in\{0,\dots,N\}$. For all $m\in\{2,\dots,N\}$, we compute (see equation (3.2) below) a first velocity field $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m \simeq \mathbf{u}(t_m)$ using only equation (1.1). We use a second-order BDF scheme for the discretization in time. We then project $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m$ (see equation (3.4) below) over a subspace of $\mathbf{P}_0$. We get a a pressure field $p_h^m \simeq p(t_m)$ and a second velocity field $\mathbf{u}_h^m \simeq \mathbf{u}(t_m)$, which fulfills the incompressibility constraint (1.2) in a discrete sense. The algorithm goes as follows. For all $m\in\{0,\dots,N\}$, we set $\mathbf{f}_h^m = \Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{f}(t_m)$. Since the operator $\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}$ is stable for the $\mathbb{L}^2$-norm we get

$$|\mathbf{f}_h^m| = |\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{f}(t_m)| \le |\mathbf{f}(t_m)| \le \|\mathbf{f}\|_{\mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbb{L}^2)}. \tag{3.1}$$

We start with the initial values

$$\mathbf{u}_h^0 \in \mathbf{P}_0\cap\mathbf{RT_0}\,, \qquad \mathbf{u}_h^1 \in \mathbf{P}_0\cap\mathbf{RT_0} \qquad p_h^1 \in P_0\cap L_0^2.$$

For all $n\in\{1,\dots,N\}$, $(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}, p_h^{n+1}, \mathbf{u}_h^{n+1})$ is deduced from $(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^n, p_h^n, \mathbf{u}_h^n)$ as follows.

- $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}\in\mathbf{P}_0$ is given by

$$\frac{3\,\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1} - 4\,\mathbf{u}_h^n + \mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}}{2\,k} - \frac{1}{\mathrm{Re}}\,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1} + \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h(2\,\mathbf{u}_h^n - \mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}) + \nabla_h p_h^n = \mathbf{f}_h^{n+1}\,, \tag{3.2}$$

- $p_h^{n+1}\in P_1^{nc}\cap L_0^2$ is the solution of

$$\Delta_h(p_h^{n+1} - p_h^n) = \frac{3}{2\,k}\,\mathrm{div}_h\,\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}\,, \tag{3.3}$$

- $\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1}\in\mathbf{P}_0$ is deduced by

$$\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1} = \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1} - \frac{2\,k}{3}\,\nabla_h(p_h^{n+1} - p_h^n). \tag{3.4}$$

Existence and unicity of a solution to equation (3.2) is classical ([5] for example). The convection term in (3.2) is well defined thanks to the following result.

Proposition 3.1. *For all $m\in\{0,\dots,N\}$ we have $\mathbf{u}_h^m\in\mathbf{RT_0}$.*

Proof. If $m\in\{0,1\}$ the result holds by definition. If $m\in\{2,\dots,N\}$ we apply the operator div_h to (3.3) and compare with (3.4). We get $\mathrm{div}_h\,\mathbf{u}_h^m = 0$. Using definition (2.12) we get $\mathbf{u}_h^m\in\mathbf{RT_0}$. ■

Let us show that equation (3.3) also has a unique solution. Let $q_h \in P_1^{nc} \cap L_0^2$ such that $\Delta_h q_h = 0$. According to proposition 4.4 we have for all $q_h \in P_0$

$$-(\Delta_h q_h, q_h) = -\big(\operatorname{div}_h(\nabla_h q_h), q_h\big) = (\nabla_h q_h, \nabla_h q_h) = |\nabla_h q_h|^2.$$

Therefore we have $\nabla_h q_h = 0$, so that $q_h = 0$ since $q_h \in L_0^2$. We have thus proved the unicity of a solution for (3.3). It is also the case for the associated linear system. It implies that this linear system has indeed a solution. Hence it is also the case for equation (3.3). Note finally that since $\mathbf{u}_h^m \in \mathbf{P}_0 \cap \mathbf{RT_0}$, we have $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_h^m = 0$ for all $m \in \{0, \dots, N\}$. Hence the incompressibility condition (1.2) is fulfilled.

4. Properties of the discrete operators

We show that the differential operators in (1.1)–(1.2) and the operators defined in section 2.3 share similar properties.

4.1. Properties of the discrete convective term

We define $\widetilde{\mathbf{b}} : \mathbf{H}^1 \times \mathbf{H}^1 \to \mathrm{L}^2$. For all $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}^1$ and $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2) \in \mathbf{H}^1$ we set $\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \big(\operatorname{div}(v_1\, \mathbf{u}), \operatorname{div}(v_2\, \mathbf{u})\big)$. We show that the operator $\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h$ is a consistent approximation of $\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}$.

Proposition 4.1. *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}^2$ and all $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}^2 \cap \mathbf{H}_0^1$ satisfying* $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} = 0$

$$\|\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0} \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) - \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h(\Pi_{\mathbf{RT_0}} \mathbf{u}, \widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P}_0} \mathbf{v})\|_{-1,h} \le C\, h\, \|\mathbf{u}\|_2\, \|\mathbf{v}\|_1.$$

Proof. We set $\mathbf{u}_h = \Pi_{\mathbf{RT_0}} \mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v}_h = \widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P}_0} \mathbf{v}$. Let $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$. According to the divergence formula and (2.6) we have

$$\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0} \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})|_K = \frac{1}{|K|} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_h^{int}} \int_\sigma \mathbf{v}\, (\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n})\, d\sigma.$$

On the other hand, let us rewrite $\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h)$. Let $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_h^{int}$. Setting

$$\mathbf{v}_{K,L_\sigma} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{v}_K & \text{si } (\mathbf{u}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})_\sigma \ge 0 \\ \mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma} & \text{si } (\mathbf{u}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})_\sigma < 0 \end{cases}$$

one checks that $\mathbf{v}_K\, (\mathbf{u}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})_\sigma^+ + \mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma}\, (\mathbf{u}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})_\sigma^- = \mathbf{v}_{K,L_\sigma}\, (\mathbf{u}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})_\sigma$. Using (2.11), we deduce from (2.13) that

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h)|_K = \frac{1}{|K|} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_h^{int}} \int_\sigma \mathbf{v}_{K,L_\sigma}\, (\mathbf{u}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})\, d\sigma.$$

Thus

$$\big(\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0} \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) - \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h)\big)|_K = \frac{1}{|K|} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_h^{int}} \int_\sigma (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_{K,L_\sigma})\, (\mathbf{u}_h \cdot \mathbf{n})\, d\sigma.$$

Let $\boldsymbol{\psi}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \Big(\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0} \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) - \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h), \boldsymbol{\psi}_h\Big) &= \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \boldsymbol{\psi}_K \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_h^{int}} \int_\sigma (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_{K,L_\sigma})\, (\mathbf{u}_h \cdot \mathbf{n})\, d\sigma \\ &= \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{int}} (\boldsymbol{\psi}_{K_\sigma} - \boldsymbol{\psi}_{L_\sigma}) \int_\sigma (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma,L_\sigma})\, (\mathbf{u}_h \cdot \mathbf{n})\, d\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{int}$. We consider the quadrilateral D_σ defined by $\mathbf{x}_{K_\sigma}$, $\mathbf{x}_{L_\sigma}$ and the vertex of σ. We set

$$D_{K,L_\sigma} = \begin{cases} D_\sigma \cap K & \text{si } (\mathbf{u}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})_\sigma \geq 0 \\ D_\sigma \cap L_\sigma & \text{si } (\mathbf{u}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})_\sigma < 0 \end{cases} .$$

Using a Taylor expansion and a density argument (see [14]) one checks that

$$\int_\sigma |\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma,L_\sigma}| \, d\sigma \leq C\, h \left(\int_{D_{K_\sigma,L_\sigma}} |\nabla \mathbf{v}\,(\mathbf{y})|^2 \, d\mathbf{y} \right)^{1/2} .$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \left(\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0} \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) - \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h(\Pi_{\mathbf{RT_0}}\mathbf{u}, \widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{v}), \boldsymbol{\psi}_h\right) \right| \\ &\leq C\, h\, \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{H}^2} \left(\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{int}} |\boldsymbol{\psi}_{L_\sigma} - \boldsymbol{\psi}_{K_\sigma}|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{int}} \int_{D_{K_\sigma,L_\sigma}} |\nabla \mathbf{v}\,(\mathbf{y})|^2 \, d\mathbf{y} \right)^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

so that $\left| \left(\Pi_{\mathbf{P_0}} \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) - \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h(\Pi_{\mathbf{RT_0}}\mathbf{u}, \widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{P_0}}\mathbf{v}), \boldsymbol{\psi}_h\right) \right| \leq C\, h\, \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{H}^2} \, \|\boldsymbol{\psi}_h\|_{1,h} \, \|\mathbf{v}\|_1$. Using then definition (2.5), we get the result. ■

Let $\mathbf{v} \in \mathrm{L}^\infty \cap \mathbf{H}^1$ and $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}^1$ with $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} \geq 0$ a.e. in Ω. Integrating by parts one checks that $\int_\Omega \mathbf{v} \cdot \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})\, d\mathbf{x} = \int_\Omega \frac{|\mathbf{v}|^2}{2} \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} \, d\mathbf{x} \geq 0$. The operator b_h shares a similar property.

Proposition 4.2. *Let* $\mathbf{u}_h \in \mathbf{RT_0}$ *such that* $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_h \geq 0$*. For all* $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$ *we have*

$$\mathrm{b}_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) \geq 0.$$

Proof. Remember that for all edges $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{int}$, two triangles K_σ et L_σ share σ as an edge. We denote by K_σ the one such that $\mathbf{u}_\sigma \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K_\sigma,\sigma} \geq 0$. Using the algebraic identity $2\, a\,(a-b) = a^2 - b^2 + (a-b)^2$ we deduce from (2.14)

$$\begin{aligned} 2\, \mathrm{b}_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) &= 2 \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{int}} |\sigma|\, \mathbf{v}_{K\sigma} \cdot (\mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma} - \mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma})\, (\mathbf{u}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K_\sigma,\sigma}) \\ &= \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{int}} |\sigma| \left(|\mathbf{v}_{K\sigma}|^2 - |\mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma}|^2 + |\mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma} - \mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma}|^2 \right) (\mathbf{u}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K_\sigma,\sigma}) \end{aligned}$$

so that $2\, \mathrm{b}_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) \geq \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{int}} |\sigma| \left(|\mathbf{v}_{K\sigma}|^2 - |\mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma}|^2 \right) (\mathbf{u}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K_\sigma,\sigma})$. This sum can be written as a sum over the triangles of the mesh. We get

$$2\, \mathrm{b}_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) \geq \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} |\mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma}|^2 \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_h^{int}} |\sigma|\, (\mathbf{u}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K_\sigma,\sigma}).$$

Using finally the divergence formula we get

$$2\, \mathrm{b}_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) \geq \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} |K|\, |\mathbf{v}_K|^2 \int_K \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_h \, d\mathbf{x} \geq 0. \qquad ■$$

The following result states that the operator b_h is stable for suitable norms.

Proposition 4.3. *There exists a constant* $C > 0$ *such that for all* $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$*,* $\mathbf{w}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$*,* $\mathbf{u}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$ *satisfying* $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_h = 0$

$$|\mathrm{b}_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h, \mathbf{v}_h)| \leq C\, |\mathbf{u}_h|\, \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h\, \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h.$$

Proof. For all triangle $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and all edge $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_h^{int}$, we have

$$(\mathbf{u}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})_\sigma^+\, \mathbf{v}_K + (\mathbf{u}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})_\sigma^-\, \mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma} = (\mathbf{u}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})_\sigma\, \mathbf{v}_K - |(\mathbf{u}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})_\sigma|\, (\mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma} - \mathbf{v}_K).$$

Using this splitting, we deduce from (2.14) $\mathrm{b}_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h, \mathbf{w}_h) = S_1 + S_2$ with

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \mathbf{v}_K \cdot \mathbf{w}_K \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_h^{int}} |\sigma|\, (\mathbf{u}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})_\sigma\,, \\ S_2 &= -\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \mathbf{w}_K \cdot \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_h^{int}} |\sigma|\, |(\mathbf{u}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})_\sigma|\, (\mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma} - \mathbf{v}_K). \end{aligned}$$

By writing the sum over the edges as a sum over the triangles we have

$$S_2 = -\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{int}} |\sigma|\, |(\mathbf{u}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})_\sigma|\, (\mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma} - \mathbf{v}_K) \cdot (\mathbf{w}_{L_\sigma} - \mathbf{w}_K).$$

Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we get

$$|S_2| \leq h\, \|\mathbf{u}_h\|_\infty \left(\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{int}} |\mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma} - \mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma}|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{int}} |\mathbf{w}_{L_\sigma} - \mathbf{w}_{K_\sigma}|^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

Since $\mathbf{u}_h \in \mathbf{RT_0}$ we have [5] the inverse inequality $h\, \|\mathbf{u}_h\|_\infty \leq C\, |\mathbf{u}_h|$. Using (2.1) and (2.2) we get

$$\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{int}} |\mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma} - \mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma}|^2 \leq C \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{int}} \tau_\sigma\, |\mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma} - \mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma}|^2 \leq C\, \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h^2$$

and in a similar way $\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{int}} |\mathbf{w}_{L_\sigma} - \mathbf{w}_{K_\sigma}|^2 \leq C\, \|\mathbf{w}_h\|_h^2$. Thus $|S_2| \leq C\, |\mathbf{u}_h|\, \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h\, \|\mathbf{w}_h\|_h$. On the other hand, according to the divergence formula

$$S_1 = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} |K|\, (\mathbf{v}_K \cdot \mathbf{w}_K) \int_K \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_h\, d\mathbf{x} = 0.$$

By gathering the estimates for S_1 and S_2 we get the result. ■

4.2. Properties of the discrete divergence

The operators gradient and divergence are adjoint: if $q \in H^1$, $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}^1$ with $\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$, we get $(\mathbf{v}, \nabla q) = -(q, \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v})$ by integrating by parts. For ∇_h and div_h we state the following.

Proposition 4.4. *For all* $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$ *and* $q_h \in P_1^{nc}$ *we have:* $(\mathbf{v}_h, \nabla_h q_h) = -(q_h, \operatorname{div}_h \mathbf{v}_h)$.

Proof. According to (2.8)

$$(\mathbf{v}_h, \nabla_h q_h) = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} |K|\, \mathbf{v}_K \cdot \nabla_h q_h|_K = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \mathbf{v}_K \cdot \Big(\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K} |\sigma| q_h(\mathbf{x}_\sigma)\, \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma} \Big).$$

By writing this sum as a sum over the edges we get

$$(\mathbf{v}_h, \nabla_h q_h) = -\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_h^{int}} |\sigma|\, q_h(\mathbf{x}_\sigma)\, (\mathbf{v}_{L_\sigma} - \mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma}) \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K_\sigma,\sigma} + \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_h^{ext}} |\sigma|\, q_h(\mathbf{x}_\sigma)\, \mathbf{v}_{K_\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K_\sigma,\sigma}. \tag{4.1}$$

On the other hand, using a quadrature formula

$$-(q_h, \operatorname{div}_h \mathbf{v}_h) = -\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \frac{|K|}{3} \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K} q_h(\mathbf{x}_\sigma)\, (\operatorname{div}_h \mathbf{v}_h)(\mathbf{x}_\sigma).$$

By writing this sum as a sum over the edges of the mesh we get

$$-(q_h, \operatorname{div}_h \mathbf{v}_h) = -\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_h^{int}} \Big(\frac{|K_\sigma|}{3} + \frac{|L_\sigma|}{3}\Big)\, q_h(\mathbf{x}_\sigma)\, (\operatorname{div}_h \mathbf{v}_h)(\mathbf{x}_\sigma) - \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_h^{ext}} \frac{|K_\sigma|}{3}\, q_h(\mathbf{x}_\sigma)\, (\operatorname{div}_h \mathbf{v}_h)(\mathbf{x}_\sigma).$$

Using definition (2.12) and comparing with (4.1) we get the result. ■

The divergence operator and the spaces L^2_0, $\mathbf{H}^1_0$ satisfy the following property, called inf-sup (or Babuška-Brezzi) condition (see [9] for example). There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\inf_{q\in L^2_0\setminus\{0\}} \quad \sup_{\mathbf{v}\in\mathbf{H}^1_0\setminus\{\mathbf{0}\}} -\frac{(q, \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v})}{\|\mathbf{v}\|_1 |q|} \geq C. \tag{4.2}$$

We will now show that the operator div_h and the spaces $P_0 \cap L^2_0$, $\mathbf{P}_0$ satisfy an analogous property. The proof uses the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\forall\, q_h \in P_1^{nc} \cap L^2_0, \qquad \sup_{\mathbf{v}_h\in\mathbf{P}_0\setminus\{\mathbf{0}\}} -\frac{(q_h, \operatorname{div}_h \mathbf{v}_h)}{\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h} \geq C\, h\, \|q_h\|_{1,h}.$$

Proof. If $q_h = 0$ the result is trivial. Let $q_h \in P_1^{nc} \cap L^2_0\setminus\{0\}$. Let $\mathbf{v}_h = \nabla_h q_h \in \mathbf{P}_0\setminus\{\mathbf{0}\}$. Using proposition 4.4 we have

$$-(q_h, \operatorname{div}_h \mathbf{v}_h) = (\mathbf{v}_h, \nabla_h q_h) = |\nabla_h q_h|^2 = |\nabla_h q_h|\, |\mathbf{v}_h|.$$

Using (2.3) and (2.4) we get $-(q_h, \operatorname{div}_h \mathbf{v}_h) \geq C\, h\, \|q_h\|_{1,h}\, \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h$. ■

We now state the result.

Proposition 4.5. *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $q_h \in P_1^{nc} \cap L^2_0$*

$$\sup_{\mathbf{v}_h\in\mathbf{P}_0\setminus\{\mathbf{0}\}} -\frac{(q_h, \operatorname{div}_h \mathbf{v}_h)}{\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h} \geq C\, |q_h|.$$

Proof. If $q_h = 0$ the result is trivial. Let $q_h \in P_1^{nc} \cap L^2_0\setminus\{0\}$. According to (4.2) there exists $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}^1_0$ such that

$$\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v} = -q_h \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathbf{v}\|_1 \leq C\, |q_h|. \tag{4.3}$$

We set $\mathbf{v}_h = \Pi_{\mathbf{P}_1^c} \mathbf{v}$. We want to estimate $-\big(q_h, \operatorname{div}_h(\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0} \mathbf{v}_h)\big)$. Since $\nabla_h q_h \in \mathbf{P}_0$ we deduce from proposition 4.4

$$-\big(q_h, \operatorname{div}_h(\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0} \mathbf{v}_h)\big) = (\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0} \mathbf{v}_h, \nabla_h q_h) = (\mathbf{v}_h, \nabla_h q_h).$$

By splitting the last term we get

$$-\big(q_h, \operatorname{div}_h(\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0} \mathbf{v}_h)\big) = (\mathbf{v}, \nabla_h q_h) - (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_h, \nabla_h q_h). \tag{4.4}$$

We bound the right-hand side of (4.4). Using (2.7) and (4.3) we have

$$|\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{v}_h| = |\mathbf{v}-\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_1^c}\mathbf{v}| \le C\,h\,\|\mathbf{v}\|_1 \le C\,h\,|q_h|.$$

Thus, using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we get

$$|(\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{v}_h,\nabla_h q_h)| \le C\,h\,|q_h|\,|\nabla_h q_h| \le C\,h\,|q_h|\,\|q_h\|_{1,h}.$$

We estimate the other term as follows. Integrating by parts we get

$$(\mathbf{v},\nabla_h q_h) = -(q_h,\operatorname{div}\mathbf{v}) + \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K}\int_\sigma q_h\,(\mathbf{v}\cdot\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})\,d\sigma.$$

We have $-(q_h,\operatorname{div}\mathbf{v}) = |q_h|^2$ thanks to (4.3). On the other hand

$$\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K}\int_\sigma q_h\,(\mathbf{v}\cdot\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})\,d\sigma = \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_h^{int}}\int_\sigma q_h\,(\mathbf{v}\cdot\mathbf{n}_{K_\sigma,\sigma})\,d\sigma$$

since $\mathbf{v}|_{\partial\Omega}=\mathbf{0}$. Using [2] p.269 and (4.3) we have

$$\left|\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K}\int_\sigma q_h\,(\mathbf{v}\cdot\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma})\,d\sigma\right| \le C\,h\,\|\mathbf{v}\|_1\,\|q_h\|_{1,h} \le C\,h\,|q_h|\,\|q_h\|_{1,h}.$$

Hence we get $(\mathbf{v},\nabla_h q_h) \ge (|q_h| - C\,h\,\|q_h\|_{1,h})\,|q_h|$. Thus we deduce from (4.4)

$$-\big(q_h,\operatorname{div}_h(\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{v}_h)\big) \ge (|q_h| - C\,h\,\|q_h\|_{1,h})\,|q_h|. \tag{4.5}$$

We now introduce the norm $\|.\|_h$. We have $\mathbf{v}_h = \Pi_{\mathbf{P}_1^c}\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{P}_1^c \subset \mathbf{H}^1$. From [5] p. 776 we deduce $\|\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{v}_h\|_h \le C\,\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_1$. Since $\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_1^c}$ is stable for the $\mathbf{H}^1$ norm, using (4.3), we get

$$\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_1 = \|\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_1^c}\mathbf{v}\|_1 \le \|\mathbf{v}\|_1 \le C\,|q_h|.$$

Therefore $\|\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{v}_h\|_h \le C\,|q_h|$. Using this inequality in (4.5) we obtain that there exists $C_1>0$ and $C_2>0$ such that

$$-\big(q_h,\operatorname{div}_h(\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{v}_h)\big) \ge (C_1\,|q_h| - C_2\,h\,\|q_h\|_{1,h})\,\|\Pi_{\mathbf{P}_0}\mathbf{v}_h\|_h.$$

We deduce from this

$$\sup_{\mathbf{v}_h\in\mathbf{P}_0\setminus\{\mathbf{0}\}} -\frac{(q_h,\operatorname{div}_h\mathbf{v}_h)}{\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h} \ge C_1\,|q_h| - C_2\,h\,\|q_h\|_{1,h}.$$

Let us combine this result with lemma 4.1. Since

$$\forall\,t\ge 0\,,\qquad \max\big(C\,t\,,\,C_1\,|q_h| - C_2\,t\big) \ge \frac{C\,C_1}{C+C_2}\,|q_h|\,,$$

we finally get the result. ∎

4.3. Properties of the discrete laplacian

We recall from [14] the coercivity of the laplacian operator.

Proposition 4.6. *For all* $\mathbf{u}_h\in\mathbf{P}_0$ *and* $\mathbf{v}_h\in\mathbf{P}_0$ *we have*

$$-(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h\mathbf{u}_h,\mathbf{u}_h) = \|\mathbf{u}_h\|_h^2\,,\qquad -(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h\mathbf{u}_h,\mathbf{v}_h) \le \|\mathbf{u}_h\|_h\,\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h.$$

5. Stability of the scheme

We first prove an estimate for the computed velocity (theorem 5.1). We show a similar result for the increments in time (lemma 5.2). Using the inf-sup condition (proposition 4.5), we infer from it some estimates on the pressure (theorem 5.2).

Lemma 5.1. *For all* $m \in \{0,\dots,N\}$ *et* $n \in \{0,\dots,N\}$ *we have*

$$(\mathbf{u}_h^m, \nabla_h p_h^n) = 0\,, \qquad |\mathbf{u}_h^m|^2 - |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m|^2 + |\mathbf{u}_h^m - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m|^2 = 0.$$

Proof. First, using propositions 3.1 and 4.4, we get $(\mathbf{u}_h^m, \nabla_h p_h^n) = -(p_h^n, \mathrm{div}_h \mathbf{u}_h^m) = 0$. Also, we deduce from (3.4)

$$2\,(\mathbf{u}_h^m, \mathbf{u}_h^m - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m) = -\frac{4\,k}{3}\big(\mathbf{u}_h^m, \nabla_h(p_h^m - p_h^{m-1})\big) = 0.$$

Using the algebraic identity $2\,a\,(a-b) = a^2 - b^2 + (a-b)^2$ we get

$$2\,(\mathbf{u}_h^m, \mathbf{u}_h^m - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m) = |\mathbf{u}_h^m|^2 - |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m|^2 + |\mathbf{u}_h^m - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m|^2 = 0. \qquad \blacksquare$$

We introduce the following hypothesis on the initial data.

$$\textbf{(H1)} \quad \text{There exists } C > 0 \text{ such that } \quad |\mathbf{u}_h^0| + |\mathbf{u}_h^1| + k|\nabla_h p_h^1| \le C.$$

Hypothesis **(H1)** is fulfilled if we set $\mathbf{u}_h^0 = \Pi_{\mathbf{RT_0}}\mathbf{u}_0$ and we use a semi-implicit Euler scheme to compute $\mathbf{u}_h^1$. We have the following stability result.

Theorem 5.1. *We assume that the initial values of the scheme fulfill* **(H1)**. *For all* $m \in \{2,\dots,N\}$ *we have*

$$|\mathbf{u}_h^m|^2 + k\sum_{n=2}^{m} \|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^n\|_h^2 \le C. \tag{5.1}$$

Proof. Let $m \in \{2,\dots,N\}$ and $n \in \{1,\dots,m-1\}$. Taking the scalar product of (3.2) with $4\,k\,\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(\frac{3\,\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1} - 4\,\mathbf{u}_h^n + \mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}}{2k}, 4\,k\,\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}\right) - \frac{4\,k}{\mathrm{Re}}\,(\widetilde{\mathbf{\Delta}}_h\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1})\\ &\quad +4\,k\,\mathrm{b}_h(2\,\mathbf{u}_h^n - \mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}) + 4\,k\,(\nabla_h p_h^n, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}) = 4\,k\,(\mathbf{f}_h^{n+1}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}).\end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

First of all, using lemma 5.1 and proceeding as in [10], we get

$$\begin{aligned}4\,k\left(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}, \frac{3\,\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1} - 4\,\mathbf{u}_h^n + \mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}}{2\,k}\right) &= |\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1}|^2 - |\mathbf{u}_h^n|^2 + |2\,\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1} - \mathbf{u}_h^n|^2 - |2\,\mathbf{u}_h^n - \mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}|^2\\ &\quad + |\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1} - 2\,\mathbf{u}_h^n + \mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}|^2 + 6\,|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1} - \mathbf{u}_h^{n+1}|^2.\end{aligned}$$

According to proposition 4.6 we have $-\frac{4\,k}{\mathrm{Re}}\,(\widetilde{\mathbf{\Delta}}_h\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}) = \frac{4\,k}{\mathrm{Re}}\,\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}\|_h^2$. Also, according to lemma 5.1 and (3.4)

$$\begin{aligned}4\,k\,(\nabla_h p_h^n, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}) &= 4\,k\,(\nabla_h p_h^n, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1} - \mathbf{u}_h^{n+1})\\ &= \frac{4\,k^2}{3}\,(|\nabla p_h^{n+1}|^2 - |\nabla p_h^n|^2 - |\nabla p_h^{n+1} - \nabla p_h^n|^2).\end{aligned}$$

Multiplying equation (3.4) by $4\,k\,\nabla_h(p_h^{n+1}-p_h^n)$ and using the Young inequality we get

$$\frac{4\,k^2}{3}\,|\nabla(p_h^{n+1}-p_h^n)|^2 \leq 3\,|\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1}-\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}|^2.$$

According to proposition 4.2, we have $4\,k\,\mathrm{b}_h(2\,\mathbf{u}_h^n-\mathbf{u}_h^{n-1},\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1},\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}) \geq 0$. At last using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, (2.3) and (3.1) we have

$$4\,k\,(\mathbf{f}_h^{n+1},\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}) \leq 4\,k\,|\mathbf{f}_h^{n+1}|\,|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}| \leq C\,k\,\|\mathbf{f}\|_{\mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbb{L}^2)}\,\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}\|_h.$$

Using the Young inequality we get

$$4\,k\,(\mathbf{f}_h^{n+1},\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}) \leq 3\,k\,\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}\|_h^2 + C\,k\,\|\mathbf{f}\|_{\mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbb{L}^2)}^2.$$

Thus we deduce from (5.2)

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1}|^2-|\mathbf{u}_h^n|^2+|2\,\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1}-\mathbf{u}_h^n|^2-|2\,\mathbf{u}_h^n-\mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}|^2+|\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1}-2\,\mathbf{u}_h^n+\mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}|^2\\
&+3\,|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}-\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1}|^2+k\,\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}\|_h^2+\frac{4\,k^2}{3}\,(|\nabla_h p_h^{n+1}|^2-|\nabla_h p_h^n|^2) \leq C\,k.
\end{aligned}$$

Summing from $n=1$ to $m-1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\mathbf{u}_h^m|^2+|2\,\mathbf{u}_h^m-\mathbf{u}_h^{m-1}|^2+3\sum_{n=1}^{m-1}|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}-\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1}|^2+k\sum_{n=1}^{m-1}\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}\|_h^2+\frac{4\,k^2}{3}\,|\nabla_h p_h^m|^2\\
&\leq C+4\,|\mathbf{u}_h^1|^2+|2\,\mathbf{u}_h^1-\mathbf{u}_h^0|^2+k^2\,|\nabla_h p_h^1|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Using hypothesis **(H1)** we get (5.1). ■

We now want to estimate the computed pressure. From now on, we make the following hypothesis on the data

$$\mathbf{f}\in\mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbb{L}^2)\,,\qquad \mathbf{f}_t\in L^2(0,T;\mathbb{L}^2)\,,\qquad \mathbf{u}_0\in\mathbf{H}^2\cap\mathbf{H}_0^1\,,\qquad \operatorname{div}\mathbf{u}_0=0.$$

One shows that if the data $\mathbf{u}_0$ and $\mathbf{f}$ fulfill a compatibility condition [11] there exists a solution $(\mathbf{u},p)$ to the equations (1.1)–(1.2) such that

$$\mathbf{u}\in\mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbf{H}^2)\,,\qquad \mathbf{u}_t\in\mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbb{L}^2)\,,\qquad \nabla p\in\mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbb{L}^2).$$

We introduce the following hypothesis on the initial values of the scheme: there exists a constant $C>0$ such that

$$(\mathbf{H2})\qquad |\mathbf{u}_h^0-\mathbf{u}_0|+\frac{1}{h}\,\|\mathbf{u}_h^1-\mathbf{u}(t_1)\|_\infty+|p_h^1-p(t_1)|\leq C\,h\,,\qquad |\mathbf{u}_h^1-\mathbf{u}_h^0|\leq C\,k.$$

One checks easily that this hypothesis implies **(H1)**. We have the following result.

Lemma 5.2. *We assume that the initial values of the scheme fulfill* **(H2)**. *Then there exists a constant $C>0$ such that for all $m\in\{1,\dots,N\}$*

$$\frac{1}{k}\,|\mathbf{u}_h^m-\mathbf{u}_h^{m-1}|\leq C.$$

PROOF. Using proposition 4.1 one proceeds as in [14]. The difference lies in the way we bound the term $\nabla_h p_h^1$. We use the splitting

$$p_h^1=(p_h^1-\Pi_{P_1^{nc}}p(t_1))+(\Pi_{P_1^{nc}}p(t_1)-p(t_1))+p(t_1).$$

Using an inverse inequality [2] we have

$$\left|\nabla_h \left(p_h^1 - \Pi_{P_1^{nc}} p(t_1)\right)\right| \leq \frac{C}{h} \left|p_h^1 - \Pi_{P_1^{nc}} p(t_1)\right| \leq \frac{C}{h} \left(\left|p_h^1 - p(t_1)\right| + \left|p(t_1) - \Pi_{P_1^{nc}} p(t_1)\right|\right).$$

Using (2.10) and hypothesis **(H2)** we get

$$\left|\nabla_h \left(p_h^1 - \Pi_{P_1^{nc}} p(t_1)\right)\right| \leq C \, \|p(t_1)\|_1 \leq C \, \|p\|_{\mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbf{H}^1)}.$$

According to (2.10) we also have $\left|\nabla_h(p(t_1) - \Pi_{P_1^{nc}} p(t_1))\right| \leq C \, \|p(t_1)\|_1 \leq C \, \|p\|_{\mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbf{H}^1)}$. Lastly $|\nabla p(t_1)| \leq \|p\|_{\mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbf{H}^1)}$. Thus we get $|\nabla_h p_h^1| \leq C$. ■

Theorem 5.2. *We assume that the initial values of the scheme fulfull* **(H2)**. *There exists a constant* $C > 0$ *such that for all* $m \in \{2, \ldots, N\}$

$$k \sum_{n=2}^{m} |p_h^n|^2 \leq C.$$

Proof. Let $m \in \{2, \ldots, N\}$. We set $n = m - 1$. Using the inf-sup condition (4.5) and proposition 4.4, we get that there exists $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{P}_0 \backslash \{\mathbf{0}\}$ such that

$$C \, \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h \, |p_h^{n+1}| \leq -(p_h^{n+1}, \operatorname{div}_h \mathbf{v}_h) = (\nabla_h p_h^{n+1}, \mathbf{v}_h). \tag{5.3}$$

Plugging (3.4) into (3.2) we have

$$\nabla_h p_h^{n+1} = -\frac{3\,\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1} - 4\,\mathbf{u}_h^n + \mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}}{2\,k} + \frac{1}{\mathrm{Re}}\, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1} - \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_h(2\,\mathbf{u}_h^n - \mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}) + \mathbf{f}_h^{n+1}.$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}(\nabla_h p_h^{n+1}, \mathbf{v}_h) = -\left(\frac{3\,\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1} - 4\,\mathbf{u}_h^n + \mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}}{2\,k}, \mathbf{v}_h\right) + \frac{1}{\mathrm{Re}} \left(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}, \mathbf{v}_h\right) \\ - \mathrm{b}_h(2\,\mathbf{u}_h^n - \mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}, \mathbf{v}_h) + (\mathbf{f}_h^{n+1}, \mathbf{v}_h).\end{aligned}$$

Thanks to proposition 4.3 and theorem 5.1 we have

$$\left|\mathrm{b}_h(2\,\mathbf{u}_h^n - \mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}, \mathbf{v}_h)\right| \leq \left(2\,|\mathbf{u}_h^n| + |\mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}|\right) \, \|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}\|_h \, \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h \leq C \, \|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}\|_h \, \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h.$$

According to proposition 4.6 we have $\left(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_h \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}, \mathbf{v}_h\right) \leq \|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}\|_h \, \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h$. Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, (2.3) and (3.1) we have

$$(\mathbf{f}_h^{n+1}, \mathbf{v}_h) \leq |\mathbf{f}_h^{n+1}| \, |\mathbf{v}_h| \leq C \, |\mathbf{v}_h| \leq C \, \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h$$

and in a similar way

$$\left|\left(\frac{3\,\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1} - 4\,\mathbf{u}_h^n + \mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}}{2\,k}, \mathbf{v}_h\right)\right| \leq C \left|\frac{3\,\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1} - 4\,\mathbf{u}_h^n + \mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}}{2\,k}\right| \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h.$$

Thus we get

$$(\nabla_h p_h^{n+1}, \mathbf{v}_h) \leq C + C \left(\frac{|3\,\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1} - 4\,\mathbf{u}_h^n + \mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}|}{2\,k} + \|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}\|_h\right) \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h.$$

By comparing with (5.3) we get

$$|p_h^{n+1}| \leq C + C \left(\frac{|3\,\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1} - 4\,\mathbf{u}_h^n + \mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}|}{2\,k} + \|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}\|_h\right).$$

Squaring and summing from $n=1$ to $m-1$ we obtain

$$k\sum_{n=2}^{m}|p_h^n|^2 \le C + C\,k\sum_{n=1}^{m-1}\frac{|3\,\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1}-4\,\mathbf{u}_h^n+\mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}|^2}{4\,k^2} + C\,k\sum_{n=1}^{m-1}\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{n+1}\|_h^2.$$

The last term on the right-hand side is bounded, thanks to theorem 5.1. And since

$$3\,\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1}-4\,\mathbf{u}_h^n+\mathbf{u}_h^{n-1} = 3(\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1}-\mathbf{u}_h^n)-(\mathbf{u}_h^n-\mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}) = 3\,\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1}-\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^n$$

we deduce from lemma 5.2

$$k\sum_{n=1}^{m-1}\frac{|3\,\mathbf{u}_h^{n+1}-4\,\mathbf{u}_h^n+\mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}|^2}{4\,k^2} \le C\,k\sum_{n=1}^{m}\frac{|\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{u}_h^n|^2}{k^2} \le C. \qquad \blacksquare$$

References

[1] S. Boivin, F. Cayre, J. M Herard, A finite volume method to solve the Navier-Stokes equations for incompressible flows on unstructured meshes, *Int. J. Therm. Sci.* **39** (2000) 806–825.

[2] S. C. Brenner and L. R. Scott, *The mathematical theory of finite element methods*, Springer, 2002.

[3] F. Brezzi and M. Fortin, *Mixed and hybrid finite element methods*, Springer-Verlag, 1991.

[4] J. Chorin, On the convergence of discrete approximations to the Navier-Stokes equations, *Math. Comp.* **23** (1969) 341–353.

[5] R. Eymard, T. Gallouët and R. Herbin, *Finite volume methods*, P.G. Ciarlet and J.L. Lions eds, North-Holland, 2000.

[6] R. Eymard and R. Herbin, A staggered finite volume scheme on general meshes for the Navier-Stokes equations in two space dimensions, *Int.J. Finite Volumes* (2005).

[7] R. Eymard, J. C. Latché and R. Herbin, Convergence analysis of a colocated finite volume scheme for the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations on general 2 or 3D meshes, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* **45**(1) (2007) 1–36.

[8] S. Faure, Stability of a colocated finite volume scheme for the Navier-Stokes equations, *Num. Meth. PDE* **21**(2) (2005) 242–271.

[9] V. Girault and P. A. Raviart, *Finite Element Methods for Navier-Stokes equations*: Theory and Algorithms, Springer, 1986.

[10] J. L. Guermond, Some implementations of projection methods for Navier-Stokes equations, *M2AN* **30**(5) (1996) 637–667.

[11] J. G. Heywood and R. Rannacher, Finite element approximation of the nonstationary Navier-Stokes problem. I. Regularity of solutions and second-order error estimates for spatial discretization, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* **19**(26) (1982) 275–311.

[12] D. Kim and H. Choi, A second-order time-accurate finite volume method for unsteady incompressible flow on hybrid unstructured grids, *J. Comp. Phys.* **162** (2000) 411–428.

[13] R. Temam, Sur l'approximation de la solution des équations de Navier-Stokes par la méthode de pas fractionnaires II, *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.* **33** (1969) 377–385.

[14] S. Zimmermann, Stability of a colocated finite volume for the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations, *arXiv*:0704.0772 (2006).

[15] S. Zimmermann, *Étude et implémentation de méthodes de volumes finis pour les fluides incompressibles*, PhD, Blaise Pascal University, France (2006).